

REMARKS

The following is intended as a full and complete response to the Advisory Action mailed on April 16, 2009. Claims 9, 11-18, 25 and 36 are pending in the application. Claims 9, 11-18, 25 and 36-37 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 9, 25 and 36 have been amended. A new claim 37 has been added to recite aspects of the invention. Applicants submit that the amendments and new claim do not introduce new matter.

Applicants request that the Examiner enter the amendment prior to continuing examination of the application.

With this response, Applicants have added the new claim 37 to recite aspects of the invention. Applicants submit that the new claim 37 is not taught by the references and respectfully request that the new claim 37 be allowed.

Further, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not properly rejected independent claims 25 and 36. In rejecting these claims, the Examiner states, “[Claims 25 and 36 are] system claim[s] substantially comprising the same limitations as claim 1 and is thus rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.” See Final Office Action dated February 9, 2009, page 6. Respectfully, claim 1 is no longer pending in the application. For this reason alone, the rejection is defective and should be withdrawn.

Further, even assuming, *arguendo*, that the Examiner had meant to refer to claim 9 instead of claim 1, the rejection is nevertheless improper. That is, the Examiner is issuing an omnibus rejection of claims 9, 25, and 36 on the basis that claims 25 and 36 recite the same limitations as claim 9. However, claims 25 and 36 in fact recite limitations not found in claim 9. For example, claim 25 recites “a set of data object points . . .” and “a set of plug-in components . . .” Further, claim 36 recites “a set of index tables . . .”, “a set of administration tools . . .”, and “an annotation broker . . .” Claim 9 recites no such limitations of either claim 25 or claim 36. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection is defective and should be withdrawn with respect to claims 25 and 36.

Applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Accordingly, it is believed that the present application now stands in condition for allowance, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe a telephone call would expedite the prosecution of the application, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. MCCLELLAN, Reg. #44227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants